

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Cesar et al. U.S. Patent 5,673,037 ("Cesar") in view of Meier European Patent Application EP 0805575 ("Meier").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Among other things, in the method of claim 1 a communication station delivers a request signal – including a check data block – to a transponder, and the transponder evaluates the check data block order to recognize whether the transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cesar and Meier, taken alone or collectively, do not teach or suggest such a feature.

At the outset, the Office Action fairly admits that Cesar does not even teach any check data block.

However, the Office Action states that Meier teaches a message structure that includes a check block.

In particular, in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action states that page 6, lines 7-16 of Meier discloses a check byte that "*identifies a group of transponder (sic) base (sic) on the algorithm used for generating the data c check block.*"

In the method recited in claim 1, a communication station delivers a request signal – including a check data block – to the transponder and the transponder evaluates the check data block order to recognize whether the transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders.

In contrast, the cited text at page 6, lines 7-16 of Meier merely discloses that

during manufacturing a unique ID number may be programmed into a transponder together with a Data BCC based on the unique ID, are programmed into the transponder's memory. Subsequently, the transponder may transmit the Unique ID and the Data BCC to an interrogator during a data transmission for verification of the transponder.

Meier does not disclose or suggest that the Data BCC stored in the transponder is ever included in any transmission from a communication station to the transponder. Furthermore, Meier does not disclose or suggest that a transponder ever evaluates any check data block received from in any request signal from any communication station to determine whether the transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders.

So Applicants respectfully submit that there is **nothing** in Meier which discloses or suggests modifying Cesar to include a check data block in Cesar's transmissions from his base station to his tags, where the check data block is significant for a particular group of transponders, and therefore is used by the tag to determine whether the tag belongs to that particular group.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is clearly patentable over any possible combination of Cesar and Meier.

Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3-4

Claims 3-4 are drawn to communication stations that include means for implementing the method of claim 1, and are therefore deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 5-6

Claims 5-6 are drawn to circuits that include means for implementing the method of claim 1, and are therefore deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 7-9

Claims 7-9 are drawn to transponders that include means for implementing the

method of claim 1, and are therefore deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 10-12

Claims 10-12 are drawn to circuits that include means for implementing the method of claim 1, and are therefore deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1-12 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT

Date: 10 July 2008

By: 

Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT
One Freedom Square
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724
Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740